

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
January 10, 2012**

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on Tuesday, January 10, 2012, in the Second Floor Conference Room in City Hall, at 8:30 a.m.

Present at the meeting were members Jennifer Czysz, James Doherty, Duene Cowan, Elizabeth Durfee Hengen, and Claude Gentilhomme. Gloria McPherson, Steve Henninger, Becky Hebert, and Donna Muir of the City Planning Division were also present, as were Craig Walker, Zoning Administrator and Mike Santa, Code Administrator.

The ADRC met in order to review the proposed design of certain sites, building, building alterations, and signs that are on the Planning Board's regular agenda for January 18, 2012, and which are subject to the provisions of the City of Concord's Zoning Ordinance in respect to architectural design review.

Agenda Items

- **Application by Abbott Bennett Group, LLC, for design review approval for a new hanging sign, located at 41 South Main Street, within the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.**

Mr. Henninger stated that the applicant is proposing a new hanging sign on an existing bracket at 41 South Main Street.

The ADRC discussed that the variable message portion of the sign overwhelms the sign, and that the sign is cluttered and messy, with a large amount of copy making it hard to read. The Committee compared other previously approved signs within the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. It was noted that it is difficult for the ADRC to make recommendations without the applicant present for discussion.

The ADRC recommended that this application be tabled until the February ADRC meeting

- **Application by St. Paul's Church for design review approval for two new affixed signs, located at 21 Centre Street, within the Civic Performance (CVP) District.**

Mr. Henninger reported that both of the new signs would be on the Centre Street façade of the building, with one sign located at the east corner and the other sign at the west corner of the building.

The ADRC recommended approval of the two signs as submitted.

- **Application by Toys R Us for design review approval for building renovations and revisions to an existing freestanding sign and two affixed signs, located at 310 Loudon Road, within the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.**

Mr. Henninger explained that the proposal was for new exterior colors, a new entrance way, and new signage for the Toys R Us on Loudon Road.

Todd Mazurek from PAEP Architecture Engineering P.C. and Gary Guillaume from Toys R Us were present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Mazurek provided the ADRC with a picture of a newly renovated store showing the changes that are being proposed at the Loudon Road store and discussed the changes to the entryway, façade colors, and signs. He stated that the new signs would use internally illuminated letters with LED lighting. Mr. Mazurek explained that the parking would change to include sign pylons for exclusive parking for expectant mothers.

The ADRC recommended approval of the building renovations and signage as submitted.

- **Consideration of an application by FOCO, Inc., for the Friendly Kitchen, for design review approval of site and building plans, along with signage, located at South Commercial Street, within the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District. (2012-0005)**

Ms. Hebert explained that this is a major site plan for the Friendly Kitchen at the site of a former gas station and car wash on South Commercial Street. She stated that the proposed driveway will be located off Constitution Avenue. The applicant has submitted a Conditional Use Permit to construct only 23 parking spaces instead of the required 79 spaces. Ms. Hebert reported that this will be a single level building, with cementitious siding, a metal roof, and a covered porch. The site will include landscaping trees, a privacy fence, and a bike rack. She stated that although the applicant will be constructing a new driveway and parking lot, there will be a significant reduction in the amount of impervious pavement.

Jonathan Halle from Warrenstreet Architects and Hope Zanes from the Friendly Kitchen were present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Halle stated that the applicant continues to work through the budget for this project and that some of the materials have yet to be finalized. He stated that the siding could be vinyl and the roofing material could be architectural shingles, as a result of these budget issues. He asked whether the ADRC could recommend approval with preapproval for these two changes.

The ADRC stated that this proposal would significantly improve the property. The applicant was asked whether safety glazing would be used in the windows in the dining area, as they were fairly close to floor level. The ADRC also noted that the plan indicates the privacy fencing to be eight feet high, while the rendering shows a much shorter fence. Mr. Halle stated that the fencing is proposed at six feet high and that safety glazing is planned for the dining area windows. The Committee also stated that while there was no recommendation for additional trees, it was suggested that several trees proposed in the southeast corner of the site be relocated around the west side of the site to provide shade for the building and outside seating area.

The ADRC recommended approval as submitted, with the option of substituting vinyl siding and architectural shingles for cementitious siding and metal roof.

- **Consideration of a proposed application by Ocean State Job Lots for design review approval for two new affixed signs and a replacement panel in an existing freestanding sign, located at 68 D'Amante Drive, within the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.**

Mr. Walker stated that there was a mix-up within the Code Enforcement Office that caused the late submittal of this application to the Planning Division, therefore, the ADRC is being asked to provide an unofficial review of the application.

Tim Sullivan from Barlo Signs was present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the letters for the two replacement affixed signs were smaller than those of the previous signs located at this property.

The ADRC discussed the color red as shown and the applicant stated that it is a standard red color. The Committee also suggested that a black reveal be used in order to conform to the existing panels within the freestanding sign. The applicant was amenable to that suggestion and stated that he would return to the ADRC in February with revised graphics.

- **Consideration of an application by Rumford Realty Corp. and Friendly Kitchen, Inc., for the construction of a parking lot located at 12-14 & 16 Montgomery Street, within the Civic Performance (CVP) District. (2012-0003)**

Mr. Henninger explained that the proposal is to tear down a fire-damaged building, which formerly housed the Friendly Kitchen, and to expand an existing 10 car parking lot into a 30-car parking lot. The applicant received a variance to allow for all parking spaces to be compact spaces within this lot. He stated that a vinyl fence will be erected at the back of the lot, and two dark sky compliant light fixtures will be installed. Mr. Henninger stated that the proposed storm-water plan will reduce rate and amount of runoff by installing perforated pipes to infiltrate a portion of the drainage. He reported that the two lots will be consolidated once approvals are granted and the sale is final. Mr. Henninger noted that staff recommended that shade trees be substituted for two ornamental trees proposed on the north side of the lot and one ornamental tree on the south side of the lot.

The ADRC recommends approval of the application has submitted, with the recommendation that shade trees be substituted as recommended by City staff.

- **Consideration of minor revisions to previously approved Architectural Elevations for Havenwood Heritage Heights, located at 141 East Side Drive, within the Medium Density Residential (RM) District. (2011-0048)**

Mr. Henninger state that the ADRC previously recommended approval to the architectural elevations for this application. The applicant is now proposing to replace the existing windows and with larger windows with mullions.

The ARDC generally found the renovations to be an improvement. Mr. Gentilhomme expressed concern with the size of the shutters but noted that the window design is consistent with other windows in the complex.

The ADRC recommends approval of the revised architectural elevations as submitted.

- **Consideration of revisions to previously approved Architectural Elevations for 12 North Main Street Realty, LLC – Siam Orchid, located at 12 North Main Street, with the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (2010-0039)**

Mr. Henninger reported that the applicant is seeking approval to revisions of the previously approved architectural elevations. The applicant is requesting approval for as-built improvements to the South Main Street façade, above the first floor, as well as changes to the rear façade on Kennedy Lane. The applicant also provided a graphic for a revised sign. Mr. Santa stated that the applicant has changed the windows in the front of the building from what was approved. The Code Division brought this to the applicant's attention.

The ADRC commented that the applicant's intent to reuse and improve the appearance of the vacant storefront on Main Street and to create two residential units on the upper floor is commendable; however, the Committee expressed serious concerns with the execution of the changes to the second floor façade on North Main Street, which include the following:

1. The actual construction was substantially different from the approved elevations.
2. The thin brick applique to the second story façade is not consistent or in keeping with restored Main Street storefronts. The original approved plans called for reusing the existing brick.
3. The windows that were installed do not have the sills and lintels shown on the approved plan which is a consistent design feature of downtown storefronts.
4. The windows that were installed are flush to the façade, not recessed as is typical of Main Street storefronts.
5. The windows are residential in design and are white in color instead of the bronze or black that was approved, and are inconsistent with typical windows in the downtown.

The ADRC also expressed the following concerns and comments regarding the proposed changes to the rear façade, which was not a part of the original 2010 approval:

1. The proposed rear elevation is not drawn to scale and does not reflect the existing conditions. There is not enough space between the ground floor and the second floor windows to install the awning and signage as shown on the drawing.
2. The ADRC advised that the existing sills and lintels need to be retained on rear elevations.
3. The Committee expressed the opinion that it is important to retain the "ghost" writing on the rear of the building, i.e., "Buckeye Mowers."

The ADRC strongly recommends the applicant engage the services of a licensed architect to address these issues and to prepare a plan in keeping with the historical character of Main Street. The Committee advised that the applicant could work within the existing window opening on the second story facing North Main Street in preparing the revised design.

- **Review of Architectural Design Review Informational brochure and Signs brochure.**

Ms. McPherson explained that the Planning Division has been working on revisions to the Architectural Design Review and Signs brochures, and both brochures should be ready for review by the ADRC at their February meeting.

- **Discussion of ADRC membership and reappointments, attendance at meetings, and application process.**

The Committee discussed the renewal of membership for Committee members whose appointments had expired. Ms. McPherson explained that Mr. King's and Ms. Hengen's terms have expired. Ms. Hengen said that she was interested in continuing to serve, but would be willing to step down if there were other residents who were interested.

The group discussed attendance at meetings, the application process, application materials provided to members, and scheduling of meetings. Members agreed that it was important for the applicant to be present at the meeting in order for the item to be discussed by the Committee, if the applicant was not present for the discussion, the item should be postponed to the next regular meeting. The Committee also agreed to continue to meet at 8:30 a.m., on the second Tuesday of the month.

There was no further business to come before the Committee, and the meeting adjourned at 9:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen L. Henninger
Assistant City Planner

SLH / djm